UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,211	07/29/2003	Paul Joseph Brady	P23661	5476

7055 7590 01/15/2008		EXAMINER
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.		STACE, BRENT S
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE		
RESTON, VA 20191	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2161	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/15/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/628,211	BRADY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brent S. Stace	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 November 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9,18,21-24,28-39,42 and 43</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,9,18,21-24,28-39,42 and 43</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 July 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   This communication is responsive to the amendment filed November 6th, 2007.

Claims 1-3, 9, 18, 21-24, 28-39, 42, and 43 are pending. In the amendment filed

November 6th, 2007, no Claims are amended, Claims 42 and 43 are new, and Claims 1

and 18 are independent Claims. The examiner acknowledges that no new matter was

introduced and the claims are supported by the specification. This action is made

FINAL.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed November 6th, 2007 with respect to Claims 1-3, 9, 18,

21-24, 28-39, 42, and 43 have been considered but are not persuasive.

3.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the Office

action allegedly "confus[ing] whether it is the identity of the caller's local service provider

or the identity of the called party's local service provider which is being received," the

examiner respectfully disagrees. Akinpelu, col. 2, lines 64-66 with Akinpelu, col. 3, lines

50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 was used to reject the limitation of "identifying a

local service provider of a caller in response to a telephone call from the caller to a

called party." Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 teaches this limitation well in that Akinpelu,

col. 4, lines 45-59 teaches that the interexchange carrier identifies the originating

carrier. The citing in Akinpelu, col. 2, lines 64-66 shows that the "carrier" being

identified is also identifying the local service provider since the Akinpelu reference

states "local service providers (i.e. local exchange carriers)." In fact, the interexchange

carrier also identifies the terminating carrier and switch for the called number, not just

the originating carrier/switch (Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 51-53). As such, the reference

teaches the identification of both the caller's and the called party's local service

providers. The Office Action is clear and does not appear to be "confusing."

4.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the Office

action allegedly "confus[ing] the call being suspended at a switch as [claimed]...with a

call being routed at a switch," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Akinpelu, col. 4,

lines 1-5 was used to reject the limitation of "the call having been suspended at a switch

of an interexchange carrier." The citing relates to the result of a test (303) if a test is a

toll call or a local call. Pending the result of this test, the call must be suspended (since

this test occurs after the local exchange carrier receives the call (Akinpelu col. 3, lines

51-54)). Additionally, local database(s) and national database(s) may be queried to

determine where to route the call between interexchange carriers. Pending the results

of these database queries, the call will also be suspended here (Akinpelu, col. 4, lines

5-15).

5.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the Office

action allegedly "confus[ing] the querying of the caller's number as [claimed]...with the

querying of the called number," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Akinpelu, cols. 3-

4, lines 53-5 was used to map to the limitation of "sending a request in a second format

to an LNP database, based on a telephone number of the caller." Akinpelu, col. 3, lines

54-57 queries an LNP (database) using the terminating telephone number of the caller.

It does this to know how to route the call to in order to complete the call. The querying

of the caller's number is not what is exactly claimed.

6.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the prior

art(s) allegedly not teaching the claimed "identification of the caller's number in a

database, determining the type of message, or launching the claimed query to the

identified base," the examiner respectfully disagrees. "Identification of the caller's

number in a database" is not what is claimed. The limitation closest to this argument is

"identification of a database to query from the LNP database" which is taught by

Akinpelu, col. 3, col. 53-63. In the cited section, Akinpelu teaches that if geographic

number (location) portability (LNP) has been implemented in the region (in order to

determine if LNP is implemented, the LNP database must be queried), then the local

database is queried (being identified as the database to query) to return the preferred

terminating local carrier (for the caller calling the called party). The argument of

"identification of the caller's number in a database" is an invalid argument since this is

not claimed subject matter. "Determining the type of message [to send to the identified

database to query]" is taught by Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 1-11 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines

60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33. In the cited sections, Akinpelu teaches some

situations where databases are queried and accessed for information. In order to

access, query, and receive information to or from a database, at least a type of

message that the database can respond with (e.g. protocol) must be determined and

used. Since Akinpelu teaches querying databases and receiving information necessary

to establish telecommunication links, Akinpelu, therefore, must determine the type of message to form to send to the identified database in order to connect the call. "Launching the claimed query to the identified [data]base" is taught by Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33. Again, these are at least some citings in Akinpelu where a query is sent to a database to retrieve information necessary to complete telephonic communication links. Since Akinpelu does this, this is teaching launching the claimed query to the identified [data]base.

7.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the Office action allegedly "confus[ing] whether an agreement exists with the caller's service provider as [claimed]...with whether an agreement exists with the called number's service provider," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The closest limitation regarding this argument is "whether an agreement exists between the identified local service provider and the interexchange carrier." This limitation is taught by Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59. Akinpelu teaches billing agreements. These agreements are in place in order to fund the organization(s) maintaining the switches etc. These agreements, as cited, identify originating carriers and termination carriers. As such, agreements are in place for the caller's service provider and the called party's service provider.

8.   As to the applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 and 18 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching "identification of the local service provider of the caller," the examiner respectfully disagrees. This argument was met above. See the argument above regarding "confus[ing] whether it is the identity of the caller's local service

provider or the identity of the called party's local service provider which is being

received."

9.   The subject matter of Claims 42 and 43 appear to be taught by Akinpelu as cited

below. Akinpelu is connecting telecommunication links. In the art this is known to be a

fast process nearly approximately, if not exactly, real-time. Also, since the queries and

responses must be correlated in order to obtain any use from the databases in

Akinpelu, the subject matter for Claims 42 and 43 appear to be taught by Akinpelu.

10.   The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously

argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed November 6th, 2007,

are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still

considered rejected based on their respective rejections from a prior Office action

(part(s) of recited again below).

Response to Amendment

Specification

11.   The specification is objected to because the lengthy specification has not been

checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors.

Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may

become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14.   Claims 1, 9, 28-35, 36, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,661,792 (Akinpelu et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,570,973 (Boughman et al.).

        Claim 1 can be mapped to Akinpelu as follows: "A method of identifying a local

service provider of a caller in response to a telephone call from the caller to a called

party, [Akinpelu, col. 2, lines 64-66 with Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col.

4, lines 45-59] the method comprising:

- receiving a request in a first format from a sender for an identity of the caller's local service provider, [Akinpelu, col. 2, lines 64-66 with Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59] the call having been suspended at a switch of an interexchange carrier; [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 1-5]

- sending a request in a second format to an LNP database, based on a telephone number of the caller, [Akinpelu, cols. 3-4, lines 53-5] to determine which of a plurality of databases to query, [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 53-63] the second format being distinct from the first format; [Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5]

- receiving an identification of a database to query from the LNP database; [Akinpelu, col. 3, col. 53-63]

- determining a message type to send to the identified database to query; [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 1-11 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33] and

- launching a query to the identified database; [Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33]

- …sending a notification to the sender, [Akinpelu, col. 6, lines 20-25 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59] the notification comprising identifying information of the identified local service provider of the caller [Akinpelu, col. 6, lines 20-25] and whether an agreement exists between the identified local service provider and the interexchange carrier" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59].

Akinpelu discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach:

- "…wherein the interexchange carrier uses the notification to decide whether to connect the suspended call to the called party."

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Boughman, teaches:

- "…wherein the interexchange carrier uses the notification to decide whether to connect the suspended call to the called party" [Boughman, col. 3, lines 29-35 with Boughman, Fig. 2 with Boughman, col. 7, lines 10-14].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Boughman with Akinpelu because both inventions are directed towards the use of telecommunication systems.

Boughman's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Akinpelu's invention because both inventions use telecommunication systems with databases and customers. Akinpelu discloses completing telecommunications calls in a competitive local and toll environment comprising querying a database, however Akinpelu does not expressly disclose using the notification to decide whether to connect the suspended call to the called party. Boughman discloses a system and method for toll notification when placing a call comprising notifying the user of whether a toll call is being placed and the MSC (interexchange carrier) deciding from the indication notification from the IN database whether or not to connect the call (based on user interaction or that call status (toll or not toll)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification from Boughman and install it into the method of Akinpelu, thereby offering the obvious advantage of giving the customer an opportunity

if they wish to complete the call or not based on the notification or automatically

connecting the call if no toll charges will be inflicted (thereby avoiding user frustration).

Akinpelu does not explicitly teach "...receiving an identification of the caller's

local service provider from the identified database in response to the query" since the

originating caller's originating carrier is identified via a trunk identification or signaling

information [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 47-51] however, it is obvious to one or ordinary skill in

the art that a caller's local service provider (carrier) is identified in the same manner that

the terminating party's local service provider (carrier) is determined since the ANI is

transmitted to the interexchange carrier [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 5-7] and since a

telephone number is all that is required to determine the terminating (caller's) party's

local service provider [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 8-11]. Doing so would offer the obvious

advantage of verifying the originating carrier through the national database(s). The

citings that would support the mapping the limitation above to Akinpelu are "...receiving

an identification of the caller's local service provider from the identified database in

response to the query" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59

(with additional focus on Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 47-51) with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 5-11].

Claim 9 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows: "The

method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the plurality of databases

comprises a line information database" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col.

5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Claim 28 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the query comprises a GetData query"

[Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 (with additional focus on

Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 47-51) with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 5-11].

Claim 29 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the query comprises an originating line

number screening query" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-67].

Claim 30 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the query comprises a billed number

screening query" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-67].

Claim 31 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, further comprising sending a request to an access

routing guide to determine which of a plurality of databases to query" [Akinpelu, col. 7,

lines 20-25].

Claim 32 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 31, wherein the access routing guide comprises a line

information database (LIDB) access routing guide" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with

Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33 with Akinpelu, col. 7, lines

20-25].

Claim 33 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein receiving an identification of the caller's local

service provider further comprises receiving an identification of a revenue accounting

office, account owner, and billing service provider associated with the telephone number

of the caller" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-67 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 13-16 with

Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 31-36].

Claim 34 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the first format comprises a text format"

[Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5].

Claim 35 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the first format comprises a ASCII text"

[Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5].

Claim 36 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1, wherein the second format comprises an SS7

format" [Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5].

Claim 42 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) as follows:

"The method according to claim 1 wherein the requests include queries and responses,

and the first and second formats of the requests enable queries and responses to be

correlated, thereby enabling the identification of the local service provider to occur in

real time" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 with Akinpelu, cols. 3-4, lines 53-5].

15.   Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,661,792 (Akinpelu et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,973 (Boughman

et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,828 (Cochrane et al.).

For Claim 2, Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) teaches: "The method

according to claim 1."

Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) discloses the above limitation but does not

expressly teach: "wherein the determining of message type is based upon a cost

associated with each of a plurality of available message types."

With respect to Claim 2, an analogous art, Cochrane, teaches: "wherein the

determining of message type is based upon a cost associated with each of a plurality of

available message types" [Cochrane, col. 8, lines 40-53 with Cochrane, col. 12, lines

17-29].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Cochrane with Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) because both

inventions are directed towards querying databases.

Cochrane's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman)'s invention because both inventions use

databases. Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) discloses completing

telecommunications calls in a competitive local and toll environment comprising

querying a database, however Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) does not expressly

disclose determining the message type is based upon a cost associated with each

available message types. Cochrane discloses support for summary tables in a

heterogeneous database environment comprising querying a database by selecting a

least cost query for the database being queried.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the querying method(s) from Cochrane and install it into the method of

Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman), thereby offering the obvious advantage of

determining the best query to perform to get the appropriate data to reduce query

impact on the database.

16.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,661,792 (Akinpelu et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,973 (Boughman

et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,452 (Kung).

For **Claim 3**, Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) teaches: "The method

according to claim 1."

Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) discloses the above limitation but does not

expressly teach: "wherein the determining of message type is based upon the message

type supported by the identified database."

With respect to Claim 3, an analogous art, Kung, teaches: "wherein the

determining of message type is based upon the message type supported by the

identified database" [Kung, cols. 6-7, lines 35-3 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Kung with Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) because both

inventions are directed towards querying databases used in telephone service.

Kung's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman)'s invention because both inventions use

databases. Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) discloses completing

telecommunications calls in a competitive local and toll environment comprising

querying a database, however Akinpelu (as modified by Boughman) does not expressly

disclose that the determination of the message type is based upon the message type

supported by each of the databases. Kung discloses a query translation system

comprising translating a query so that the query can be executed in a different database

system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the query methods from Kung and install it into the method of Akinpelu

(as modified by Boughman), thereby offering the obvious advantage of gaining support

for querying other databases from one location.

17.   Claims 18, 21, 22, 24, 37-39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,661,792 (Akinpelu et al.) in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,496,828 (Cochrane et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,452

(Kung).

For **Claim 18**, Akinpelu teaches: "A system for identifying a local service provider

of a caller associated with a telephone call from the caller to a called party, [Akinpelu,

Figs. 1, 7 with Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59] the system

comprising:

- a gateway comprising a plurality of platforms configured to dynamically load

   share requests, [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 23-34] the gateway receiving a request in

   a first format requesting an identification of the local service provider of the caller,

   [Akinpelu, col. 2, lines 64-66 with Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col.

   4, lines 45-59 with Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5] the gateway configured to

determine one of a plurality of message types in which to query an identified database, [Akinpelu, col. 3, col. 53-55 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 1-11 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33] the identified database being determined as a result of sending a request in a second format distinct from the first format to an LNP database and receiving a response from the LNP database, [Akinpelu, cols. 8-9, lines 51-5] to launch a query to the identified database" [Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Akinpelu discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...wherein the gateway determines the message type based upon a cost associated with each of a plurality of available message types and based upon a message type supported by the identified database."

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Cochrane, teaches:

- "...wherein the gateway determines the message type based upon a cost associated with each of a plurality of available message types" [Cochrane, col. 8, lines 40-53 with Cochrane, col. 12, lines 17-29 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65].

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Kung, teaches:

- "...and based upon a message type supported by the identified database" [Kung, cols. 6-7, lines 35-3 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Cochrane and Kung with Akinpelu because the inventions are directed towards querying databases.

Cochrane's and Kung's inventions would have been expected to successfully work well with Akinpelu's invention because the inventions use databases. Akinpelu discloses completing telecommunications calls in a competitive local and toll environment comprising querying a database, however Akinpelu does not expressly disclose determining the message type is based upon a cost associated with each available message types and based upon a message type supported by the one of the plurality of databases. Cochrane discloses support for summary tables in a heterogeneous database environment comprising querying a database by selecting a least cost query for the database being queried. Kung discloses a query translation system comprising translating a query so that the query can be executed in a different database system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the querying method(s) from Cochrane and Kung and install them into the method of Akinpelu, thereby offering the obvious advantage of determining the best and correct query to perform to get the appropriate data to reduce query impact on the database thereby gaining support for querying other databases from one location.

Akinpelu does not expressly teach "the gateway receiving a request requesting an identification of the local service provider of the caller" and "to receive an identification of the local service provider of the caller" since the originating caller's originating carrier is identified via a trunk identification or signaling information [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 47-51] however, it is obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art that a caller's local service provider (carrier) is identified in the same manner that the

terminating party's local service provider (carrier) is determined since the ANI is

transmitted to the interexchange carrier [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 5-7] and since a

telephone number (ANI) is all that is required to determine the terminating (caller's)

party's local service provider [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 8-11]. Doing so would offer the

obvious advantage of verifying the originating carrier through the national database(s).

The citings that would support the mapping the limitations above to Akinpelu are "the

gateway receiving a request requesting an identification of the local service provider of

the caller" and "to receive an identification of the local service provider of the caller"

[Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 (with additional focus on

Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 47-51) with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 5-11].

Claim 21 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18, wherein the request is received prior to the

telephone call being connected to the called party" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with

Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Claim 22 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18, wherein the request is received during the

pendency of the telephone call" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines

60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Claim 24 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18, wherein <u>the identified database</u> comprises a

line information database" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65

with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Claim 37 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18, wherein the request is received after the call

has been connected to the called party and before the call has been disconnected"

[Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54 with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines

29-33].

Claim 38 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18, the identified database having been

identified as a result of a request sent to an LNP database and a request sent to an

access routing guide" [Akinpelu, col. 6, lines 25-33 with Akinpelu, col. 7, lines 20-25].

Claim 39 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 38, wherein the access routing guide comprises

a line information database (LIDB) access routing guide" [Akinpelu, col. 3, lines 50-54

with Akinpelu, col. 5, lines 60-65 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 29-33].

Claim 43 can be mapped to Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) as

follows: "The system according to claim 18 wherein the requests include queries and

responses, and the first and second formats of the requests enable the queries and

responses to be correlated, thereby enabling the identification of the local service

provider of the caller to occur in real time" [Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59 with Akinpelu,

cols. 3-4, lines 53-5].

18.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,661,792 (Akinpelu et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,828 (Cochrane

et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,452 (Kung), further in view of U.S. Patent No.
4,975,942 (Zebryk).

For **Claim 23**, Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) teaches: "The
system according to claim 18."

Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung) discloses the above limitation but
does not expressly teach: "wherein the request is received after the telephone call has
been disconnected."

With respect to Claim 23, an analogous art, Zebryk, teaches: "wherein the
request is received after the telephone call has been disconnected" [Zebryk, col. 3, lines
15-39 with Akinpelu, col. 4, lines 45-59].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to combine Zebryk with Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung)
because both inventions are directed towards the use of telecommunication systems.

Zebryk's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with
Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung)'s invention because both inventions use
telecommunication systems with databases and customers. Akinpelu (as modified by
Cochrane and Kung) discloses completing telecommunications calls in a competitive
local and toll environment comprising querying a database, however Akinpelu (as
modified by Cochrane and Kung) does not expressly disclose launching a query after
the telephone call. Zebryk discloses a credit/calling card pay telephone method and
system employing telephone unit local card-checking and other intelligence cooperative

with local personal host computer comprising recording call information after the call has terminated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification from Zebryk and install it into the method of Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung), thereby offering the obvious advantage of accurately recording call records of Akinpelu (as modified by Cochrane and Kung).

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Stace   b. s.

APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER